Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Attached is a cleaned-up drawing that identifies FIG. 2 as prior art as required by the Rules. An axis A has been added to FIGS. 1 and 2. Now net matter has been added.

The claims have been amended. A new US-style main claim 6 has been inserted in the case and claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Translated claims 3--5 have been amended to improve their language, make them better comply with US Rules, and depend from the new US-style main claim. New US-style dependent claims 7--9 have been added.

The new main claim describes as shown in FIGS. 3 and 4 a conveyor drum for a textile-treatment device. The drum comprises:

a pair of ends 11 and 12 spaced apart along an axis A;

a generally cylindrical foraminous wall 5 extending axially between the ends 11 and 12:

an array of sheet metal stiffener strips 10 lying in respective generally radially extending planes and extending axially between the ends 11 and 12;

a plurality of rigid connectors 20" extending angularly between the strips 10 and each having

- a pair of angularly oppositely directed end faces engaging the respective strips 10,
- an angularly extending, radially outwardly directed, and radially outwardly pointed outer edge 34,
- an angularly extending and radially inwardly directed inner edge 35,
- an angularly throughgoing outer bore 32 adjacent the outer edge 34,
- an angularly throughgoing inner bore 33 adjacent the inner edge 35, and
- a pair of side walls 37 and 38 extending radially and angularly from the outer edge to the inner edge and forming between the bores a hollow chamber 36; and

respective angularly extending screw fasteners 29 and 23 engaged in the bores 32 and 33 and clamping the stiffener strips 10 angularly to the end faces of the connectors 20".

This system is intended to operate such that, when the drum is rotating about its axis to move a textile web or the like being subjected to a suction treatment by drawing air inward

through the foraminous wall of the drum, any material in the drawnin liquid will not collect on and foul the connectors 20". Due to the connector's flat sides and pointed outer edge (the inner edge might as shown in the prior-art embodiment of FIG. 2 engage the shaft carrying the drum) any liquid will flow along the connectors and be thrown centripetally off, radially outward.

In the admitted prior art of US 4,811,574 (and in related US 4,912,945) of Fleissner, FIG. 2 and FIG. 3, which is substantially identical to FIG. 2 of this application, show a system where there are no sharp-edged connectors. Instead the radial outer edge 18 that bears on the inner face of cylindrical conveyor screen is clearly square (see also FIG. 5 of Fleissner) and nothing resembling sharp. Thus a rejection on Fleissner alone under \$102 is impossible because no "sharp" edge is shown. Since the outer edge flange 24 of Fleissner bears directly on the inner surface of the screen 19, it would not be obvious to make it sharp edge since this would in effect be concentrating the load from a surface to a line, making a \$103 rejection also impossible.

Neither does Fleissner show a pair of angularly and radially extending side walls forming a hollow chamber. The side walls indicated by the examiner extend axially and radially as clearly shown in FIG. 2 of Fleissner where the axis would be horizontal. Thus for this reason also a rejection on Fleissner is impossible.

Atty's 23563 Pat. App. 10/578,296

Going further features of the dependent claims even more clearly distinguish over Fleissner. Nothing in Fleissner suggests the arrow-shaped edges of claim 8. The surfaces of claim 9 and the parallel side walls of claim 4 are similarly clearly novel over Fleissner on their own.

Thus all claims are clearly allowable over the applied art. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted, K.F. Ross P.C.

//Andrew Wilford// by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597 Attorney for Applicant

29 February 2008

5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900

Bronx, NY 10471-0900 Cust. No.: 535 Tel: 718 884-6600 Fax: 718 601-1099

Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: <u>email@kfrpc.com</u>

Enclosure: Corrected version

Substitute Specification Substitute Abstract

Replacement drawing (2 sheets)